

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virgina 22313-1450 www.spole.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | |
|----------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------------|--|
| 09/955,939 | 09/20/2001 | Jonathan R. Merril | 1033262-000003 | 9957 | |
| | 7590 04/06/200 INGERSOLL & ROO | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| POST OFFICE BOX 1404 | | | RIES, LAU | RIES, LAURIE ANNE | |
| ALEXANDRIA | ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | | 04/06/2009 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Nation of About annual | 09/955,939 | MERRIL, JONATHAN R. | |
| Notice of Abandonment | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | LAURIE RIES | 2176 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication | appears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence address | |
| This application is abandoned in view of: | | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the c (a) A reply was received on (with a Certificate period for reply (including a total extension of time). | of Mailing or Transmission date | | |
| (b) A proposed reply was received on, but it of | loes not constitute a proper reply | under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection | |
| (A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final reje application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with | filed Notice of Appeal (with appe | | |
| (c) ☐ A reply was received on but it does not co final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (| | fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non- | |
| (d) No reply has been received. | | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fe from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PT) | OL-85). | | |
| (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable,), which is after the expiration of the statute Allowance (PTOL-85). | | | |
| (b) The submitted fee of \$ is insufficient. A ba | lance of \$ is due. | | |
| The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$ | The publication fee, if require | ed by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$ | |
| (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, h | as not been received. | | |
| Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as Allowability (PTO-37). | required by, and within the three | -month period set in, the Notice of | |
| (a) ☐ Proposed corrected drawings were received on _ after the expiration of the period for reply. | (with a Certificate of Mailing | g or Transmission dated), which is | |
| (b) No corrected drawings have been received. | | | |
| The letter of express abandonment which is signed to the applicants. | by the attorney or agent of record | , the assignee of the entire interest, or all of | |
| The letter of express abandonment which is signed to 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application. | by an attorney or agent (acting in | a representative capacity under 37 CFR | |
| The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Int court review of the decision has expired and there are | | y 2009 and because the period for seeking | |
| 7. The reason(s) below: | | | |
| | | | |

/Laurie Ries/ Primary Examiner Technology Center 2100 30 March 2009

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to

A telephone call was made by Examiner Laurie Ries on 30 March 2009 to Attorney Charlies Wieland, which confirmed that no response has been filed to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference decision rendered on 26 January 2009.